

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Substitute Figures 6 and 7 are presented by the present response in which original Figures 6 and 7 are labeled as "Prior Art" as suggested in the Office Action.

The specification is amended by the present response to correct for minor informalities, including addressing the objection noted therein on page 2 of the Office Action. The claims are also amended to make minor clarifications.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. Claims 4-6 are allowed. Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,148,306 to Yamada et al. (herein "Yamada") in view of U.S. patent 6,471,360 to Rukavina et al. (herein "Rukavina"). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamada in view of Rukavina as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,062,920 to Jordon et al. (herein "Jordon").

Initially, applicants gratefully acknowledge the early indication of the allowance of claims 4-6. Those claims are amended by the present response to make a minor clarification, that is not believed to narrow those claims in any aspect.

Applicants also gratefully acknowledge the interview granted by Examiner Choi to applicants' representative on August 19, 2003. During that interview, the outstanding rejections were discussed in detail. Further, during that interview amendments to claim 1 were discussed to clarify claim 1 over the applied art. The present response sets forth the discussed claim amendments. During the interview, Examiner Choi tentatively agreed that such claim amendments appear to distinguish claims 1-3 over the applied art.

Addressing now the rejections of claims 1-3, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Independent claim 1 is amended by the present response to clarify a feature recited therein, and is specifically amended to clarify the structure of the metal foil terminals by reciting "the metal foil terminals extending between the opposed glass plate and the end of the lower transparent conductive layer and the end of the insulated portion of the lower transparent conductive layer". Such a feature is shown, as a non-limiting example, in Figure 1 in the present specification. As shown in Figure 1, the metal foil terminals 17 extend from the opposed glass plate 16 to the lower transparent conductive layer 12. Such a feature as clarified in the claims is believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

The outstanding Office Action is based on Yamada disclosing terminals 8a and 2 in Figure 3. However, as is clear from Figure 3, Yamada does not disclose or suggest any such terminals extending from the opposed glass plate 6. Thus, amended independent claim 1, and claims 2 and 3 dependent therefrom, are believed to recite a structure that clearly differs from that in the applied art. Thus, claims 1-3 are also believed to be allowable.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599



22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
GJM/SNS/cja

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423